

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Infent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/735,429	735,429 12/12/2003		Jean-Christophe Francis Audonnet	454313-3159.1	2595	
20999	7590	08/21/2006		EXAMINER		
		RENCE & HAUG	SALVOZA, M FRANCO G			
745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL. NEW YORK, NY 10151				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	•			1648		

DATE MAILED: 08/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summers	10/735,429	AUDONNET ET AL.	AUDONNET ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	M. Franco Salvoza	1648		
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REWHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pe  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by s Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the n earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re n. eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT statute, cause the application to become ABA	ATION.  Oly be timely filed  HS from the mailing date of this communication.  NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1 2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) 2 3) Since this application is in condition for all closed in accordance with the practice und	This action is non-final.  wance except for formal matte			
Disposition of Claims				
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the applica 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) 1-29 are subject to restriction and	ndrawn from consideration.			
9) The specification is objected to by the Exar 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	accepted or b) objected to be the drawing(s) be held in abeyand prection is required if the drawing(s)	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). b) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for force a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Bu * See the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been received. nents have been received in Ap priority documents have been r rreau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	plication No eceived in this National Stage		
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SE Paper No(s)/Mail Date		/Mail Date ormal Patent Application (PTO-152)		

Application/Control Number: 10/735,429 Page 2

Art Unit: 1648

## **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

Claims 1-14, drawn to a method of immunizing an equine host, classified in class
 424, subclass 184.1.

II. Claims 15-29, drawn to a vaccine composition, classified in class 435, subclass235.1.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case a recombinant virus can be used in materially different methods such as to screen compounds or express proteins.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above, have acquired a separate status in art because of recognized divergent subject matter and different classifications, and because the literature and sequence searches required for any one of the groups is not required for the others, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

# Species Election

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species:

Application/Control Number: 10/735,429 Page 3

Art Unit: 1648

Once an Invention is elected, further election is required

- One recombinant virus must be elected (canary pox, fowlpox or pigeon pox) from the

viruses recited in claim 1

o If canary pox is elected, one strain must be elected for expression of influenza

HA protein from those recited in each of claims 13 and 14

One adjuvant must be elected from those recited

o If the polymer adjuvant having monomeric units according to the provided

formula is elected, further election is required;

• R1 and R2 are either identical or different;

H or CH3 for each of R1 and R2

X is 0 or 1;

Y is 1 or 2

o If acrylic polymer is elected, allyl sucrose or allyl pentaerythitol must be

elected

The species are independent or distinct because:

Virus species and strains; adjuvants, polymers and structural components: The related

inventions are distinct if the inventions as claimed do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually

exclusive; the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants; and the inventions as claimed are

either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation,

function, or effect. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the viral species, strains, and

adjuvants containing different structural elements are separate products having distinct functions,

Art Unit: 1648

distinct structures, and distinct physical, chemical and functional properties requiring separate searches of the prior art.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1, 10, 15, 24 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Art Unit: 1648

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier.

Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116. Amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined

claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is

## Conclusion

withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to M. Franco Salvoza whose telephone number is (571) 272-8410. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bruce Campell can be reached on (571) 272-0974. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/735,429

Art Unit: 1648

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <a href="http://pair-direct.uspto.gov">http://pair-direct.uspto.gov</a>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

M. Franco Salvoza
Patent Examiner

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

Dune Campell

Page 7